

-9-

**REMARKS**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 17-20 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mesuda et al (US 5,563,921); rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mesuda et al in view of Ishida et al ("Ishida") and Ellis, II et al ("Ellis"); and rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mesuda et al in view of Fattouche et al ("Fattouche"). The Examiner indicated that claims 2-10, 12-16, and 22 depended upon rejected base claims and would be allowable if rewritten. Similarly, multiple dependent claims 12, 17-21, and 23-25 should be allowable if they depended from allowable claims.

By this amendment, Applicants have rewritten claims 2 and 3, which were indicated as being allowable, into independent form. Applicants have amended claims 12, 17, and 21 to depend from claims 2-11, instead of claims 1-11. Applicants have canceled independent claims 1 and 26. Claims 2-25 are in the case.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks allowance of claims 2-25 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFREY A. KLECK et al

By 

Matthew D. Rabdau  
Reg. No. 43,026  
Patent Attorney for Applicant

TEKTRONIX, INC.  
P.O. Box 500 (50-LAW)  
Beaverton, OR 97077  
(503) 627-7261

7175 US